

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 445

UD 029 391

AUTHOR Boyd, William L.; Raffel, Jeffrey A.
TITLE Urban Education Today.
INSTITUTION Temple Univ., Philadelphia. Center for Research in Human Development and Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO CRHDE-92-9
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 11p.; A journal article reprinted in the CRHDE Publication series.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT Journal of Planning Literature; v5 n1 p22-28 Aug 1990

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Change; Elementary School Students; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Financial Support; *High Risk Students; Information Dissemination; Limited English Speaking; *Minority Groups; *School Organization; Secondary School Students; Social Services; Teacher Supply and Demand; Urban Problems; *Urban Schools; Urban Youth
IDENTIFIERS *Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

Problems that beset urban education in general are analyzed, and solutions are discussed and evaluated by a policy working group of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. The most acute problem in American education involves the unmet needs of disadvantaged students, who are heavily concentrated in urban school systems. Almost every one of our nation's largest city school systems has a predominantly minority enrollment and a high percentage of students whose first language is not English. Accepting that the nation must invest in at-risk students, and that the Federal Government should lead in this process, the following five areas identify specific needs that must be addressed: (1) assisting urban students through social services; (2) addressing teacher shortages and needs; (3) developing and disseminating information about effective teaching and instructional technology; (4) developing appropriate organizational arrangements; and (5) solving financial problems with increased aid. Specific recommendations are made for national action, which include teacher pension programs, incentives for teacher improvement, programs for minority students, and encouragement of innovation in instruction and organization. Urban universities have an important role to play in forming partnerships with urban educators to promote educational quality. (SLD)

ED360445

URBAN EDUCATION TODAY

*W.L. Boyd, J.A. Raffel, and other members of
NASULGC's Urban Education Policy Working Group*

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



Temple University Center for Research
in Human Development and Education

Urban Education Today

William L. Boyd

**The Pennsylvania State University
and
National Center on Education in the Inner Cities**

Jeffrey A. Raffel

**University of Delaware
College of Urban Affairs and Public Policy**

and other members of the

**National Association of State
Universities and Land Grant Colleges
Urban Education Policy Working Group**

The research reported herein was supported in part by the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education (CRHDE) and in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education through a grant to the National Center on Education in the Inner Cities (CEIC) at Temple University. The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position of the supporting agencies, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Abstract

In this article, the authors present an analysis of the problems that plague urban education in general and discuss and evaluate solutions to these problems as devised by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

Urban Education Today

NASULGC Urban Education Policy Working Group

The most acute problem in American education today involves the unmet needs of disadvantaged students, who are heavily concentrated in urban school systems. There is a growing concentration of children in central cities at risk of not receiving an education sufficient to help them enter the mainstream of American society. The bureaucratic dynamics of large urban systems frequently produce rigidities that impede the adaptability and resourcefulness necessary to meet these students' needs. Teachers and students often feel locked into a system that provides little flexibility and few incentives for creative engagement with learning. Lacking distinction and excitement, the educational program is frequently bland and boring, especially in the lower tracks, where many disadvantaged students are found. Alternately, many teachers attempt to make class work as interesting as possible with little regard for rigorous standards and academic appropriateness of content. It is no wonder, then, that student dropout and teacher burnout rates reach crisis proportions in many urban school systems. On top of this unacceptable waste of human talent, social and demographic trends are raising an unavoidable question: With the shift from seventeen workers for every retired person in 1950 to a projection of only three workers (one of whom will be a minority person) for every retired person in 1992, how much longer can we afford high failure rates in educating at-risk youth?

The federal government has a major responsibility to assist in solving these problems for several compelling reasons. First, because state and local governments must compete with one another to attract and retain productive citizens and businesses, they are quite limited in their ability to pursue expensive public policies that redistribute resources from the productive sector to needy special populations. Only the federal government is positioned, economically and politically, to be able to provide ade-

quate financial aid for this redistributive purpose. Second, the disadvantaged, at-risk population can and does migrate to where the jobs and benefits are, creating an interstate or national welfare problem. Third, as outlined above, the future economic prospects, as well as the national security, of the nation may be jeopardized if we do not do a much more effective job of educating our growing at-risk population of young people. The Council of Great City Schools (1987) recently reported statistical information that reflects the discouraging conditions in the country's forty-four largest school districts providing services to urban children. The council reported the following:

- 75% of children enrolled in Great City schools are minorities.
- 45% of Great City School children are black.
- 22.7% of Great City School children are Hispanic.
- 4.9% of Great City School children are Asian.
- 33% of children enrolled in Great City schools come from families receiving public assistance.

This article is the work of the NASULGC URBAN EDUCATION POLICY WORKING GROUP. Chair of the committee was Jeffrey Raffel, University of Delaware. Committee members included William Boyd, Pennsylvania State University; Sandra Elman, University of Massachusetts at Boston; Eugene Eubanks, University of Missouri - Kansas City; Donna Evans, Wayne State University; the late Mario Fantini, University of Massachusetts at Amherst; the late Eleanor Farrar, State University of New York at Buffalo; Marcia Marker Feld, University of Rhode Island; Norma Furst, Harcum Junior College; Paul Geisel, University of Texas at Arlington; Gloria Grantham, University of Delaware; Edward Hill, Cleveland State University; Martin Katzman, Oak Ridge National Laboratory; George LaNoue, University of Maryland, Baltimore County; and Herbert Walberg, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Journal of Planning Literature, Vol. 5, No. 1 (August 1990).
Copyright © 1990 by Sage Publications, Inc.

- 80% of children enrolled in Great City schools are eligible for free or reduced-price school lunches.
- 110 different languages are spoken by students in the 44 Great City school districts.
- 15.1% of total national education expenditures was spent on urban schools in 1970.
- 12.4% of total national expenditures was spent on urban schools in 1985.
- 45% of eligible children were not served by the federal Chapter I program in 1984.
- The extent of teacher shortages in central-city schools was 2.5 times the overall rate when compared with the extent of teacher shortages in all schools.
- One-third of the school buildings in the Great Cities are over 50 years old.

Almost every one of our nation's large city school systems has a predominantly minority enrollment and a high percentage of students whose first language is not English. In Boston, for example, seventy percent of the school population is now black or Hispanic. The majority of students come from families receiving welfare, and almost as many live in public housing projects. In New York City, two-thirds of the students in 1958 were white; by 1980, sixty-nine percent were black or Hispanic. Of the over one-half million students in Los Angeles, less than twenty-five percent are white — almost fifty percent are Hispanic and twenty-five percent are black. In Dallas, over seventy different languages are spoken by the district population.

Urban black and Hispanic children are less likely to achieve in school, less likely to complete high school, and less likely to go on to college than their peers. Although there are some positive indications that black student achievement on standardized tests is improving, urban black and Hispanic students lag far behind in measured school achievement. While twenty-five percent of students drop out nationwide, rates in our largest cities range from thirty to fifty percent. After rising for many years, black college attendance has declined over the last several years. The American Council on Education reported that the percentage of 18- to 24-year-old black high school students entering college in 1985 dropped appreciably since 1976 — from thirty-four percent to twenty-six percent.

Our nation's city school systems have a growing concentration of students who are more likely to be below national norms in achievement, have special educational problems, and have language difficulties. Fewer and fewer students from all backgrounds come to school well-fed, well-prepared, and well-supported.

The overarching theme that emerges from this picture of the status of urban education today, and the nation's needs of tomorrow, centers on investment. The nation needs to invest in today's urban students in order to be ensured that they will be fulfilled citizens who can contribute to and reap the benefits of a productive nation tomorrow. Failure to make a sufficient investment will

result in two classes of Americans — those informed citizens who are contributing to and benefiting from the mainstream of American life and those removed from the opportunities and responsibilities of citizenship who form a permanent underclass.

As the National League of Cities Institute (1988, 5) has concluded:

An investment in education — early childhood education, primary and secondary education, post-secondary education, or adult education, or in eliminating discrimination — is an investment in productivity and individual growth that pays off in every community and across the nation. . . . The failure to make those investments leads to . . . problems — increased demands for public services, unemployment and underemployment, poverty, crime, sickness, and hopelessness.

This same theme is emphasized in the report prepared by NASULGC's Urban Economic Development Working Group: "Unless action is taken soon, the labor shortage will also threaten national growth" (see p. 7, above). Similarly, the omnibus education reauthorization act recently passed by the Senate was justified by the Committee on Labor and Human Resources (U.S. Senate, 1987, 2) as a "prudent investment in our country's future."

It is time for bipartisan agreement that it is wiser, more cost-effective, and a national priority to spend funds on improving urban schools today rather than to suffer the consequences of failure tomorrow in our criminal justice and social service systems. The choice is not between paying now or paying later, but rather between investing now or incurring higher costs later.

RESOURCE NEEDS, FEDERAL ISSUES, AND RECOMMENDED POLICIES

Accepting that this nation must invest in at-risk students in urban areas and that it is appropriate and wise for the federal government to lead in this process, what resources are required? The role of the federal government must be strengthened as the structure of urban schooling is reexamined. While financial resources alone will not solve urban educational problems, solutions without adequate financing are doomed to failure. This article specifies the needs that must be addressed, the issues before the federal government in addressing them, and the related policies and programs within the context of five basic resources that are the building blocks of urban education — urban students, educational personnel, information about teaching and instructional technology, organizational structure, and finances.

Students

Studies of student achievement have consistently found that the social-economic background of students is the major determinant of success in school and on standardized tests. In a number of ways, the socioeconomic status

of those we will depend on in the future (which is so strongly related to the family's educational support system) is declining. If we allow social background to continue to play this large a role, our nation will face some difficult times ahead. Estimates indicate that the disadvantaged segment of our shrinking school population is growing, and these students are concentrated in our cities. Our nation is becoming more and more dependent on fewer and fewer non-disadvantaged students.

The traditional nuclear family has rapidly disappeared from the American scene, and no new support system has as yet replaced it:

In 1955, 60% of the households in the U.S. consisted of a working father, a housewife mother and two or more school age children. In 1980, that family unit was only 11% of our homes, and in 1985 it is 7%, an astonishing change. . . . The Census tells us that 59% of the children born in 1983 will live with only one parent before reaching 18—this now becomes the NORMAL childhood experience. (Hodgkinson 1985, 3)

According to the Council of Great City Schools (1987), a majority (fifty-nine percent) of black children were born to unmarried mothers in 1984.

Learning in school critically depends upon the emotional, social, and cognitive predispositions that children develop at home. Children growing up in homes assailed by economic insecurity, poverty, and despair frequently do not receive parental encouragement to study, to do homework on time, and to excel in school. For this reason, the concerns raised by NASULGC's economic development, housing, and poverty committees have serious implications for education. Unless society provides support services traditionally provided by the family—adequate nutrition, supervision of homework, day care—schools as they are currently constituted will have difficulty solving the problems of poor academic performance. The nation needs to ensure that the nonacademic complications of youth are addressed and that the preconditions of successful learning for urban students are in place.

Our increasing dependence on those we have historically counted on least comes at a time when the role of the federal government—the major governmental advocate for children in educational need—has been under question, if not attack. Hodgkinson (1985) found that government spending for poor children has decreased during the past decade. While the number of children eligible for programs like Head Start has increased, program funding has remained almost constant.

The major national issue here is whether the federal government will change its rationale and associated policies for helping children in disadvantaged circumstances. Will the federal government shift from providing funds and services out of largess to providing sufficient funds and services for lifting children out of disadvan-

tagged circumstances? Although many motives underlay the federal programs of the two prior decades aimed at those students in special need, a principal basis for the programs was fairness, helping those who had limited resources to help themselves. The demographic trends that are manifest as we enter the 1990s suggest that lifting children from disadvantaged circumstances to the mainstream of American society is now a matter of both national and self-interest. Will the American public respond to this new reality? Will the isolation of children in need continue?

We must acknowledge changes in the structure of the family and recognize that schools are increasingly called upon to perform functions once handled by the family. Urban schools need help in coordinating and delivering social services in and near schools. As the council report (1987, iii) concludes, "Schools as institutions may not be able to cure all our social ills, but surely they will be the hub around which services to children are delivered." We need to encourage the provision of adequate preschool, day care, latch-key, parenting, health, and associated services for those children least likely to receive such services without government help.

Personnel

Urban school districts will bear the brunt of the nation's teacher shortages. The declining number of black teachers may harm urban school districts searching for quality teachers who are also role models for black students. The council projects the percentage of blacks in the 1990 teaching force will be only five percent, and colleges are graduating only one-third the number of minority teachers that are needed to close the racial gap. Hispanic teachers are also sorely needed. A recent Carnegie study (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, n.d.) found that urban teachers face many more problems than their peers in suburban or rural schools. The need for quality teachers, those who not only can serve as role models but who are also substantively competent and instructionally effective, is most severe in our cities.

The issue is whether the federal government will take a strong leadership role to recruit, train, and retain quality teachers or take a laissez-faire approach. Should the federal government support the movement toward a national (but not federal) procedure for licensing teachers? Should the federal government take a hands-off position on teachers, leaving this aspect of education to the states and local school districts?

The nation needs to recruit a substantial portion of its best and brightest, especially among minorities, to teach in our urban schools. Federal policies must encourage this to occur. This has become a program of overriding national significance, analogous to previous efforts at encouraging our best students to become scientists.

The federal government should take the lead in making elementary and secondary teaching more of a national profession through improving the decision-making authority, working conditions, perquisites, and benefits of professional educators, especially teachers. Movement into and within the profession should be encouraged. Incentives to remain in the profession are a necessity, as are programs to recruit minority teachers.

Information

While educational leaders have called repeatedly for smaller class sizes to solve the educational ills of our nation, research has indicated that such a simple solution is unlikely to work. A number of dilemmas raised by educational research in the last decade suggest that tangible resources alone will not solve our urban educational problems. Educational research has indicated that resources are not consistently related to student achievement. Thus a successful call for more federal educational aid to urban disadvantaged students will not necessarily lead to more urban student success. The nation needs to continue to gather, disseminate, and encourage the utilization of information about effective teaching and instructional technology.

The federal government's ability to do this is tempered by the finding that top-down educational reform is a limited means to achieve meaningful change. Many reforms are converted to common (and ineffective) practice in the implementation process. Thus simply calling for more federal regulation or leadership may not lead to school improvement in urban areas.

Educational research in the last decade has made progress in identifying those conditions and methods that lead to the most productive improvements in student learning. In the last several years investigators have devised methods to synthesize research and sharpen its implications for schools, particularly those in urban areas (Walberg 1984).

The major issue for the federal government in this area is whether its traditional liaison role is sufficient or, alternatively, whether federal leaders should serve as luminaries in disseminating information. How can the federal government play a leadership role in a system characterized by its loose linkages? What should the "bully pulpit" be used for? How can the federal government convince those who actually deliver educational services to use proven effective methods?

We believe that the federal government must continue to play a major role in research and development in education. It must continue to help in determining what is "good technology" in education and support its dissemination and use. The federal government must continue to serve as a liaison and clearinghouse for educational research, while helping and encouraging appro-

priate technology to be utilized in the nation's schools. In addition, the federal government must expand its efforts to measure the extent to which our nation's children are being successfully educated across international, national, state, and local jurisdictions.

Organization

Appropriate organizational arrangements are required to provide incentives for educational leaders to combine available resources in an efficient manner so as to provide services desired and appropriate for clientele. Organizations are most responsive when the clientele enjoy choices that have financial consequences for administrators and the clientele have the information to choose wisely. The more resources a family has, the more choices it has and the more incentives for organizations to provide the services they need and desire. Urban students need more choices. The nation needs to encourage more intra- and interschool diversity and choice in public school systems in urban areas.

The major issue that must be faced is the degree to which the federal government can help the nation be a laboratory for various alternative organizational arrangements without violating the local nature of American school organization. We believe that the federal government should be a leader in the movement toward public school choice, institutional flexibility, and diversity within and among schools. As such, the federal government should fund experiments and demonstrations with a variety of organizational arrangements that increase diversity and choice, ensure that processes and impacts are carefully measured, and disseminate the results.

One choice that should be open to all children is the choice to attend a desegregated school. Research shows that minorities who attend desegregated schools are generally more able to function in the mainstream of American society.

Financial

School districts serving urban children face a host of financial problems resulting from the concentration of students with special needs. Urban school districts were the first to face bankruptcy in the 1980s. Urban schools must spend far more per pupil than suburban schools because of this educational overburden as well as higher costs in general and greater program needs (e.g., vocational education, desegregation plans). They face these added burdens with limited revenue capabilities due to limited fiscal capacity, lower incomes of residents, general municipal overburden, and deteriorating citizen support.

At a time when aid to those in educational need is most important, federal aid has not kept pace. In the Great City Schools, federal revenue has declined. Adjusted for in-

flation, federal aid to these districts declined twenty percent from the 1980-81 school year to the 1985-86 school year. The council estimates, for example, that less than fifty percent of those children eligible for Chapter 1 services were served in 1984. The nation needs sufficient federal resources targeted to urban education in recognition of our nation's increasing dependence on at-risk urban students.

The major question for the federal government is how to leverage its resources within the fiscal limitations it faces. Working within its historic funding boundaries in a time of fiscal limits, how can the federal government derive the maximum from its involvement without playing an inappropriate dominant role? How large a financial role can and should the federal government play in public education?

We reaffirm that the paramount role of the federal government must continue to be one of redistributing resources to those most in educational need and that more resources must be devoted to this effort. There is today a national interest in investing in children that is greater than in previous generations. This effort should take place primarily through current federal programs, specifically Chapter 1 and the Education for All Handicapped Children Act,¹ as well as other programs recommended in this article.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NATIONAL ACTION

- The federal government should take the lead in ensuring that the wide array of programs needed to support the preconditions for learning are in place and coordinated. The Head Start program, for example, should be fully funded so that each disadvantaged preschool child receives appropriate learning experiences and related support. Day care and latch-key programs are needed to provide family support as well as opportunities for at-risk children to learn. Health clinics are necessary for at-risk students to maintain good health as a precondition for learning. A wide variety of special programs aimed at dropouts, parent education, and summer school or year-round schooling should be supported by the federal government as demonstrations and to provide analyses of what works to encourage and support learning. Employment and career guidance programs are also necessary. The resources and talents of our professions (e.g., health, legal, business) should be tapped, as well as our community colleges and universities.

With the growth of social services, supplementary, and support programs, there is an increased need for coordination in cooperation with the public schools. Case-management programs should be supported and examined, such as the New Jersey program, which matches each identified student with an adult who coordinates and manages services.

- The federal government should help to establish and support programs that would make elementary and sec-

ondary teaching more of a profession. This should be accomplished through a variety of means including demonstration grants, experimentation, research, and encouraging and helping other institutions to move in this direction.

An important first step would be helping to establish a portable pension system similar to TIAA/CRF as well as increasing the availability and feasibility of sabbaticals and grants for teacher development. Those who teach the educationally disadvantaged should be the priority of such a system. Summer internship programs and other types of supplementary professional employment for teachers should be encouraged. Funds for mentor teacher programs should also be considered.

A specific program for minority students to study for undergraduate and graduate teaching degrees, perhaps modeled after the Title 9 Public Service Fellowships and Graduate Professional Opportunities Program, is a necessity to encourage minorities to become teachers. A National Teacher Corps and programs to provide loan forgiveness or other incentives, analogous to those for doctors, to teachers who teach in areas with high concentrations of at-risk students should be considered.

Programs that lead to more effective teachers reaping the fruits of their labor should be supported and the results reported. These programs could take the form of career ladders, merit pay, or other approaches. Teaching in urban schools presents a special challenge, and funds are needed to examine preservice and in-service urban teacher preparation and to provide effective training for teachers who teach urban students.

Pilot programs for enhancing teacher decision-making should be funded and analyzed. Site management plans—the most encouraging approach at this time—give all those at the school site greater say in the governance of the school. This approach, such as the one under way in Dade County, Florida, can increase variety and creativity in educational programs as well as enhance the sense of commitment by teachers and parents through shared governance of community schools.

While enacting a list of programs would be helpful, there is a need for a single focus of efforts to enhance the profession of teaching within the federal government. A National Endowment for Teaching should be considered to create such a focus and to coordinate efforts at increasing teacher professionalism.

- The federal government has been active in disseminating useful information on school improvement. *What Works: Research about Teaching and Learning* (1986), a 60-page pamphlet on specific parenting, teaching, and effective school techniques produced by the U.S. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, was circulated upon request to over one million educators and parents. Efforts to measure national and international educational conditions and accomplishments, such as those undertaken through the National Assessment of

Educational Progress (NAEP), deserve continued funding. In fact, states and localities should be encouraged to use NAEP's services to determine the educational level of their students.

The U.S. Senate has included in Senate Bill 173 (1987) a federal program to promote school innovation modeled after the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. This program should be passed and appropriately funded from resources targeted toward innovation in urban areas. Programs that encourage school-university and school-business collaboration and preservice and in-service training for teachers of at-risk students should be priorities, as should new approaches to language difficulties and dropout rates. We need to know more about teaching methods, pedagogy, and curricula that lead to greater urban student educational achievement.

- A wide range of alternative organizational arrangements that encourage inter- and intraschool diversity and choice should be funded by the federal government with adequate provisions for the careful analysis of results and dissemination. For example, some contend that if students and parents have a choice of schools and programs, then educators would be provided with incentives for improving the education of urban students. Others contend that such changes would deflect educators from the education of at-risk children. Experiments that create parent and student choice in metropolitan areas should be funded as demonstration projects throughout the nation and carefully evaluated. Legislation has passed the Senate that would provide grants to school districts that abolished attendance boundaries, allowing students to enroll in the public school of their choice.

Other demonstration grants are needed to test organizational arrangements that deserve consideration, including school-site management and the provision of program and performance data or "report cards" on schools, so parents and students have the necessary information to make informed choices about alternative schooling options and educators have increased incentives for high performance. Another option for investigation could be the effects of systematic parental evaluations or ratings of schools to increase parent "voice" in school governance. The impact of informed community involvement should be tested in a wide variety of forms.

The examples suggested by the Urban Economic Development Policy Working Group, in their call for "increased federal funding for research, including demonstration projects," are appropriately noted here:

Additional federal funding for research and demonstration projects should explore such issues as how to keep young people in school through graduation, the effects of year-round schooling and longer school days on educational attainment, and the role of preschool day care

on children's future academic performance. Also to be taken into consideration are the role of day care in promoting the labor force participation of young women, the combining of work experience with high school education, the possibilities of monetary and non-monetary incentives in student performance, the effectiveness of financial incentives for teacher performance, and the need for and impact of school management and reorganization on service delivery. (See p. 7, above.)

Intraschool changes, such as having high school classes meet three times each week instead of daily, using lectures plus sections to teach some courses, and rotating professional jobs in the school, should be tried and evaluated.

In a number of areas, magnet schools have succeeded in increasing school desegregation while improving the education of minority and majority students. The Magnet Schools Assistance Title of the 1984 Education for Economic Security Act² should be expanded. Inter-jurisdictional magnet programs should be a high priority of this act. These programs will increase choice, parental and student involvement, and school desegregation. In addition, public officials should be encouraged to make other decisions that foster school desegregation, for example, those involving public housing programs.

While federal regulations are necessary to ensure the targeting of funds to urban students, those that limit flexibility and innovation should continue to be reexamined.

- The central role of federal aid in elementary and secondary education must continue to be a redistributive one. Federal funding for special populations remains critical. Chapter 1 and funds for the handicapped (Education for All Handicapped Act) should be funded to a much greater degree and targeted more to urban students in need. The cost of assimilating immigrants falls disproportionately upon large city school systems, and the costs of this national problem should be borne federally. More funds are required through the Emergency Immigrant Education Act of 1984³ and subsequent legislation. The infrastructure of urban schools is in a deteriorated condition; federal as well as state attention to the condition of urban school facilities is paramount.

ROLE FOR URBAN UNIVERSITIES

- University programs that bring urban students in contact with urban universities at an early age, involve role models, and inform students of what they need to do to attend college should be adopted on a widespread basis.
- Recent public debate and pressure has focused on the means by which teachers are prepared (e.g., the length of programs), rather than the ends of teacher preparation. What is needed is a focus on the goals of teacher education preparation programs as related to the expectations of schools and society. Most important, we need to analyze the specific role of teacher preparation programs in urban universities that prepare teachers for the

nation's troubled areas; that is, do urban teachers require different skills enabling them to tap into the strengths of children in urban areas? Teacher education and training that provides teachers with a broader understanding of urban students must be encouraged and supported. This should include more language and multicultural awareness training. The latter should include courses and associated fieldwork in sociology, economics, and so on, which lead to a better understanding of the urban community in terms of demographics and local economic structures.

- Reading and hearing useful information is only the beginning in our nation's efforts to improve schools—particularly in cities. State universities have a particularly important role to play in taking the research implications the required several steps further. They should continue to bring this information to the pre-service and in-service individuals whom they educate, and they should continue to produce school-relevant research. But they can and are going beyond these roles.

Urban institutions should continue to form partnerships and other working relationships with urban educators. Some of these are described in the NASULGC publication, *Joining Forces for Urban Youth* (Martin, Mocker, and Brown 1986). One particularly positive example is the University of Illinois Chicago Area School Effectiveness Council, which brings together university faculty and urban and suburban educators. Quarterly meetings provide a forum for presenting research findings, exchanging views, and arranging joint projects among faculty and sets of educators from several districts. Programs that bring urban students to urban universities, often viewed as positive, neutral sites, should be supported. Programs that bring members of the university community, including educators, to urban classrooms should be expanded. Service linkages, as well as technical assistance, should be encouraged.

- Universities should be active participants in partnerships with urban schools. This is especially helpful with magnet and special-purpose schools. Incentives and an institutional framework should be established for teachers and faculty to enter into exchange relationships built on shared disciplines (e.g., biology). Similarly, faculty should be involved in proposing and evaluating organizational alternatives.

NOTES

1. 20 U.S.C. § 1400.
2. 20 U.S.C. § 3901 et seq.
3. 20 U.S.C. § 3121.

REFERENCES

- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. n.d. *An imperiled generation: Saving urban schools*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Council of Great City Schools. 1987. *Challenges to urban education: Results in the making*. Washington, D.C.: Council of Great City Schools.
- Hodgkinson, Harold L. 1985. *All one system: Demographics of education, kindergarten through graduate schools*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Martin, Deanna C., Donald W. Mocker, and Nevin C. Brown. 1986. *Joining forces for urban youth*. Washington, D.C.: NASULGC.
- National League of Cities Institute. [1988] *Investing in home town America: Ten issues for the 1988 elections*. Washington, D.C.: NLCI.
- U.S. Office of Educational Research and Improvement. 1986. *What works: Research about teaching and learning*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- U.S. Senate. Committee on Labor and Human Resources. 1987. *Report on the Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary Education Improvement Act of 1987*. Washington, D.C.: GPO.
- Walberg, Herbert. 1984. Improving the productivity of America's schools. *Educational Leadership* 41, 8: 19-30.